

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 – 9, 13, 15 – 21 and 23 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3 – 9, 13, 15 – 21, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carneal et al. (WO 99/08429, hereinafter Carneal) in view of Gupta (U.S. Pat. No. 6,212,565, hereinafter Gupta). Claims 1, 3 – 9, 13, 15 – 21, and 23 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. (“An In-depth Survey on Web Caching,” hereinafter Zhang) in view of Dillon et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,658,463, hereinafter Dillon). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Carneal, Gupta, Zhang nor Dillon, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the present invention. Carneal does not disclose a mobile platform, let alone the use of a user communication device (UCD) on a mobile platform. In fact, Carneal teaches away from using a UCD on a mobile platform as the disclosure of Carneal is directed towards improving network communications between multiple land based computers. See Carneal, p.6. The passages in Carneal cited by the Examiner speak of wireless communications between *land* based computers, and do not disclose communications between a land based computer *and a mobile platform*. See Carneal, p.20, lines 3 – 5 and p.1, lines 13 – 20. Similarly, Dillon fails to teach or suggest the use of a UCD on a mobile platform. Rather, Dillon appears to teach only

the use of satellite servers for land based networks which interface with a inbound channel such as a “dial-up connection to the internet.” See Dillon, col. 4, lines 22-42. The passages in Dillon cited by the Examiner also do not disclose or suggest the use of a mobile platform, and only speak of wireless communications between *land* based systems. See Dillon, col. 13, lines 12 – 20, col. 24, lines 33 – 36, Fig. 5 at 122. Gupta and Zheng are likewise silent regarding the use of a UCD on a mobile platform. It is further submitted that Carneal, Gupta, Zheng and Dillon are all silent as to the use of a UCD on a mobile platform to access web pages. See Carneal, p.1, line 30 – p.2, line 8; Dillon, col. 11, lines 58 – 61 and col. 12, Table 1. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s belief that these references, in combination, disclose a UCD on a mobile platform is the result of hindsight reasoning.


Independent claim 1 recites “a user communication device (UCD) located on [a] mobile platform and connected to [a] child proxy server.” Independent claims 7, 13 and 20 recite similar features. Accordingly, as Carneal, Gupta, Zheng and Dillon all fail to teach or suggest the use of a UCD on a mobile platform, it is believed that independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 20 are in condition for allowance. Further, claims 3 – 6, 8, 9, 15 – 19, 21 and 23 depend from claims 1, 7, 13, and 20, and are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons cited above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 29, 2005

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk
Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/sdo